SCRAPS FROM HISTORY.

The Practical Result of a Democratic Tariff.

The following exhibit from official records will enable the reader to judge for himself whether the industries of the country are safe in the hands of the Democracy. The thinly woven theories published by the advocates of Free Trade to capture votes, may often appear very plausible to those who have not given the question a careful examination, but the *facts* are unanswerable.

The Tariff of 1846 was a Democratic measure. The party had made a solemn pledge to the people to sustain their industries, and on this pledge elected its President, as well as a majority of Congress. It may therefore be considered as an embodiment of party doctrine on this vital question.

James K. Polk became President, and Robert J. Walker, a pronounced Free Trader, was made Secretary of the Treasury. The Tariff of 1842, under which the country had prospered, was repealed, and the Free Trade Tariff of 1846 replaced it.

Henry C. Carey thus wrote of the condition of the country under the Protective Tariff of 1842 :

At the close of this brief period of real "prosperity" [in 1846], how great was the change. Labor everywhere was in demand. Planters had large crops, and the domestic market was growing with a rapidity that promised better prices. The produce of the farm was in demand, and prices had risen. The consumption of coal, iron, wool and cotton, and woolen cloth was immense and rapidly increasing, while prices were falling, because of the rapidly improving character of the machinery of production. Production of every kind was immense, and commerce, internal and external, was growing with unexampled rapidity. Shipping was in demand, and its quantity was being augmented at a rate never before known. Roads and canals were productive. Corporations had been resuscitated, and States had recommended payment, and the credit of the Union was so high that the same persons who had villified the people and the government of the Union in 1842, were now anxious to secure their custom on almost any terms—having become as fawning now as before they had been insolent.

In a letter to Robert J. Walker, then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Carey said :

The Tariff of 1846 has caused the total ruin of thousands and ten of thousands of the most useful men in the country. It tends to the utter destruction of the coal and the iron, the cotton and the woolen interests; and unless its progress be stayed, at that goal we must soon arrive, as must be admitted even by yourself. For all this we should find some compensation. If we produce less coal and iron, we should have more wheat to sell. If we make less cotton cloth, we should export more cotton. If we make less woolen cloth, we should raise more wool. If we build fewer factories, we should export more tobacco. If we build fewer furnaces, we should export more corn and pork, and all these things we must do or largely diminish our consumption of cloth and iron,

because if we do not make we must buy them, which can be done only by producing commodities which their producers are willing to receive in exchange for them. If these things have happened there may be found therein some compensation for diminished production of cloth and iron; but if they have not happened then there is no compensation for the vast destruction we have witnessed and are daily witnessing.

Have they happened? Have we more wheat to export? On the contrary, we have less from year to year. Have we more cotton, rice, tobacco, corn and pork to sell? The answer is found in the fact that the quantity for export diminishes from year to year. The demand for ships diminishes and the demand for labor diminishes, and instead of this country becoming from year to year more and more an asylum for the down-trodden people of Europe, it becomes from year to year less so; and with the diminution of immigration there is a diminution of the number of persons with whom we maintain perfect freedom of trade, untrammeled by the interference of custom-house officers. Under the tariff of 1842 immigration trebled, and with each immigrant we established perfect freedom of trade. Under the tariff of 1846 immigration has became stationary, with a tendency to decline, and the number of arrivals in the last fiscal year is little greater than it was three years before. Perfect free trade has ceased to extend itself. We trade now with a million of Europeans, still residents in Europe, who, but for the enactment of the tariff of 1846, would now be Americans.

Hon. Abram Hewitt of New York, seeing the ruin attendant upon this Democratic Tariff, stated the following as his platform:

He said he was not a Whig, but a Democrat. Still he went for protection now, as he and his party did in 1844, and he went for General Taylor because he would sign a bill to protect American labor. He did not ask for any unreasonable duty. He only asked for a duty equal to the difference between American labor and English labor, &c.

At a meeting of working men Mr. Hewitt offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That this meeting, composed of men who depend for their livelihood upon the labor of their own hands, hold the following facts and principles to be undeniably true, viz:

That natural wealth is the fruit of individual labor.

That, therefore, is the best government and the best policy which secures to the hand that earns it the largest possible return for its labor.

That the superiority of free institutions and economical government is proved by the fact that in the United States the average wages of labor are from three to four times as large as under the monarchial governments of Europe.

That while foreign labor is paid at this price, it would be worse than insanity to adopt any policy by which the wages of our labor should be reduced to the same level, because it would be throwing away all the advantages secured to us by a free and economical government.

Subsequently Mr. Hewitt depicted the workings of this infamous Tariff, of which the following is an extract:

That hence arises the necessity of a tariff, which, properly devised, is merely a system whereby the price of labor, which naturally results under free and economical government, is prevented from being reduced to the pauper level of labor which just as naturally results under governments where the first fruits of labor, instead of being secured to the hand that earns them, are filched away in order to maintain the costly splendor of thrones and the idle extravagance of an enervated aristocracy.

Then follows this picture of the iron interests, given by Mr. Hewitt:

"And first, what is the real condition of the domestic iron trade? Is it actually depressed and threatened with ruin, or does all the outcry proceed from men who, having realized 'princely fortunes' annually, are now clamorous because their profits are reduced to reasonable limits, or from another class who, having erected works in improper locations, desire not so much to make iron cheaply as to build up villages and speculate in real estate? Undoubtedly to some extent there are such cases, * * * but as to the great fact that the great majority of establishments judiciously located and managed with skill and economy have been compelled to suspend work throughout the land for want of remunerating work there cannot be a shadow of a doubt.

"Again, of fifteen rail mills only two are in operation, doing partial work, and that only because their inland position se-

cured them against foreign competition, for the limited orders of neighboring railroads, and when these are executed not a single rail mill will be at work in the land."

In the House of Representatives, on the 12th of August, 1850, Hon. Joseph Casey of Pa., declared:

The whole history of the manufacture of iron in Pennsylvania shows that in a period of seventy-five years there have been erected 500 furnaces, and out of them 177 failures or where they have been closed out by the sheriff. Out of this 177 failures 124 of them have occurred since the passage of the Tariff of 1846. And out of 300 blast furnaces in full operation when the Tarift of 1846 was enacted into a law, or fully one-half, had stopped several months ago, and fully 50 more are preparing to go out of blast.

President Fillmore, in his annual message, dated December 2, 1841, says:

The values of our domestic exports the last fiscal year, as compared with those of the previous year, exhibit an increase of $43,646,322. At first view this condition of our trade with foreign nations would seem to present the most flattering hope of its future prosperity. An examination of the details of our exports, however, will show that the increased value of our exports for the last fiscal year is to be found in the high price of cotton, which prevailed during the last half of that year, which price has since declined about one-half. The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low Tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from $68,701,921 in 1847 to $26,051,373 in 1850 and to $21,848,653 in 1851, with a strong probability, amounting almost to a certainty, of a still further reduction in the current year. The aggregate value of rice exported during the last fiscal year as compared with the previous year also exhibit a decrease amounting to $460,917, which, with a decline in the values of the exports of tobacco for the same period, make an aggregate decrease in these two articles of $1,156,741.

The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise, it was thought by those who promoted and established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country, by increasing the demand and raising the price of agricultural products in foreign markets.

The foregoing facts, however, seem to show incontestably that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

In a subsequent message President Fillmore urges:

In my first annual message to Congress I called your attention to what seemed to me some defects in the present tariff and recommended such modifications as in my judgment were best adapted to remedy its evils and promote the prosperity of the country. Nothing has since occurred to change my views on this important question.

Without repeating the arguments contained in my former message, in favor of discriminating protective duties I deem it my duty to call your attention to one or two other considerations affecting this subject. The first is the effect of large importations of foreign goods upon our currency. Most of the gold of California, as fast as it is coined, finds its way directly to Europe in payment for goods purchased. In the second place, as our manufacturing establishments are broken down by competition with foreigners, the capital invested in them is lost, thousands of honest and industrious citizens are thrown out of work and the farmer, to that extent, is deprived of a home market for the sale of his surplus produce. In the third place, the destruction of our manufactures leaves the foreigner without competition in our market, and he consequently raises the price of the article sent here for sale as is now seen in the increased cost of iron imported from England. The prosperity and wealth of every nation must depend upon its productive industry. The farmer is stimulated to exertion by finding a ready market for his surplus products, and benefited by being able to exchange them, without loss of time or expense of transportation, for the manufactures which his comfort or convenience requires. This is always done to the best advantage where a portion of the community in which he lives is engaged in other pursuits.

In 1860, under this model Democratic Tariff of 1846, which found the country in affluence and prosperity, and left it bankrupt, destroying our trade until it failed to supply the Government with sufficient revenue to meet its current expenses, our credit fell lower than ever before or since in our history. A Treasury statement gives the figures at which the Gov-

ernment under the last Democratic President borrowed money in 1860, giving Treasury notes therefor.

At 6 per cent.	$70,200
At 7 per cent.	5,000
At 8 per cent.	24,500
At 8½ per cent.	33,000
At 8¾ per cent.	10,000
At 8 per cent.	65,000
At 9¼ per cent.	10,000
At 9½ per cent.	160,000
At 9¾ per cent.	77,000
At 10 per cent.	1,027,500
At 10¼ per cent.	266,000
At 10½ per cent.	623,000
At 10¾ per cent.	1,367,000
At 11 per cent.	1,432,700
At 12 per tent.	4,840,000
Total	10,010,900

And this is the inevitable results of free trade. The destruction of our industries, reducing our laboring classes, manufacturing and agricultural, to want and misery, the ruin of commerce and trade, and that of the people and nation.

Per contra, U. S. Bonds under Republican rule, are negotiated at 3 per cent.

This specimen of Democratic Tariff legislation, and its effect on a nation are submitted to the voters of the State with this simple question. Are you ready for a repetition of the legislation of 146, and are you willing to entrust that party with your interest which bankrupted you, and the nation when it was in power?

If you are, then you can support that party—if not, your duty is to aid the Republican party in securing ample protection to home labor, and through this, guaranteeing to our people increased prosperity. The issue was never plainer than in this great campaign of 1884.